

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-5 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

#### **Specification**

The Examiner objected to the specification due a number of informalities. Applicants have amended the specification to overcome these informalities.

First, the Examiner objected to the phrase in paragraph [0005]. Applicants have now reworded this phrase to be more correct. At the same time, Applicants have corrected the paragraph numbering of that paragraph and the preceding paragraph, which were in reverse order.

The Examiner questioned the use of roman numerals in regard to the figure numbers. By way of the present Amendment, Applicants have removed the roman numerals.

In paragraph [0024], Applicants have corrected the reference to the redundant area to refer to the redundant page

#### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claim 1 as having a misspelled word in line 6. By way of the present Amendment, Applicants have corrected this error.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner objected to the use of certain terminology. By way of the present Amendment, Applicants have changed instances of "logic page" to --logical page--. Applicants have also inserted a definition of redundant page in claim 1.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner indicated that "the writing method" in line 3 is incorrect. Applicants have now corrected this to refer to the linking method. In regard to line 7, Applicants have changed the language to indicate that the mother and child blocks have the same logical address, as suggested by the Examiner. In regard to claim 9, Applicants have indicated that the block refers to said child block. In regard to line 10, Applicants have inserted the word "redundant." Also, in line 10, Applicants have used the term "corresponding," which now makes it clear that it is the two pages which correspond to each other.

The final paragraph of claim 1 has been amended to insert "of," "to be," and "stored in." The final four words have been removed and the phrase suggested by the Examiner "when a subsequent read has been performed" has been inserted.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patent relied upon by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.


Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant